

JOHN NEWMAN

THE *PARAMĀDIBUDDHA* (THE *KĀLACAKRA MŪLATANTRA*)
AND ITS RELATION TO THE EARLY *KĀLACAKRA*
LITERATURE*

*/ato ye paramādibuddhan na jānanti te nāmasaṅgītin na jānanti/
/ye nāmasaṅgītin na jānanti te vajradharañānakāyan na jānanti/
/ye vajradharañānakāyan na jānanti te mantrayānaṃ na jānanti/
/ye mantrayānaṃ na jānanti te samsāriṇaḥ sarve vajradharabhagavato mārgarahitāḥ/
/evaṃ paramādibuddhaṃ mokṣārthibhiḥ sacchisyaṭṭh śrotavyaṃ sadguruṇā deśayitavyam iti/
Vimalaprabhā 1.6.2¹*

*//de'i phyir gang gis mchog gi dang po'i sangs rgyas mi shes pa de yis mtshan yang dag par brjod
pa mi shes so//gang gis mtshan yang dag par brjod pa mi shes pa des rdo rje 'dzin pa yi ye shes
kyi sku mi shes so//gang gis rdo rje 'dzin pa'i ye shes kyi sku mi shes pa des sngags kyi theg
pa mi shes te/ gang gis sngags kyi theg pa mi shes pa de dag thams cad ni/ 'khor ba pa ste/
bcom ldan 'das rdo rje 'dzin pa'i lam dang bral ba'o//de lta bas na mchog gi dang po'i sangs
rgyas ni/ bla ma dam pa rnams kyis bstan par bya zhing thar pa don du gnyer ba'i slob ma dam
pa rnams kyis mnyan par bya'o//²*

“Therefore, those who do not know the *Paramādibuddha* do not know the *Nāmasaṅgīti*. Those who do not know the *Nāmasaṅgīti* do not know the Gnosis Body of Vajradhara. Those who do not know the Gnosis Body of Vajradhara do not know the Mantrayāna. Those who do not know the Mantrayāna are all samsaric – they are separate from the path of Bhagavān Vajradhara. Thus, noble gurus should teach the *Paramādibuddha*, and noble disciples who strive for liberation should listen to it.”³

The purpose of this article is to present some information about the *Paramādibuddha* – the *Kālacakra mūlatantra* – and its relation to the early *Kālacakra* literature. First we will examine a synoptic traditional account of the early history of the *Kālacakra* tradition.⁴ Knowledge of this is a prerequisite for meaningful discussion of the development of the *Kālacakra* literature.

According to the *Kālacakra* tradition, the Buddha taught the *Paramādibuddha* to Sucandra, the king of Sambhala, at the Dhānyakaṭaka stupa in Andhra.⁵ Sucandra, who was an emanation of Vajrapāṇi, headed an enormous entourage that included the ninety-six satraps of Sambhala.⁶ On this occasion the Buddha taught not only the *Kālacakra* system, but the Vajrabhairava (Yamāntaka), Heruka (Cakrasaṃvara), and other tantric systems as well. Sucandra wrote the twelve thousand verse *Kālacakra mūlatantra* down in a volume and returned to Sambhala.

Puṇḍarīka tells us that Sucandra composed a sixty thousand line commentary on the *Paramādibuddha*.⁷ Tibetan traditions say that Sucandra's commentary was called the *Vimalaprabhā*, and was the namesake of Puṇḍarīka's *Vimalaprabhā* that will be discussed below. (The only information available on Sucandra's

Vimalaprabhā is Puṇḍarīka's reference to it, and Indian and Tibetan references probably derived from this. When referring to 'the *Vimalaprabhā*' without any other qualification, I always mean Puṇḍarīka's commentary on the *Śrī Kālacakra* – the *Kālacakra laghutantra*.)

The *Kālacakra* system was transmitted by six more emperors in the dynasty of Sambhala, and thus came into the hands of King Yaśas. Yaśas, an emanation of Mañjuśrī (also called Mañjuḥṣa and Mañjuvāja), came to be known as the first Kalkī of Sambhala (*kalkin*, poss. of *kalkaḥ*; *rīgs ldan*). He was given the title Kalkī (literally, 'possessor of the clan,' i.e., chieftain) because he unified the four castes (*varṇaḥ*; *rīgs*) of Sambhala within a single *vajra* family (*kulam*; *rīgs*):

*vāgmī vajrakule yena tena vajrakulī yaśaḥ/
caturvarṇaikakalkena kalkī brahmakulena na//*

*/smra mkhas rdo rje'i rīgs dang ldan/
/grags pas rdo rje'i rīgs la ni/
/rīgs bzhir rīgs gcig byas gang des/
/rīgs ldan tshangs pa'i rīgs kyis min/*⁸

After Yaśas unified the four castes of Sambhala by means of the Vajrayāna initiations, he taught them an abridged (*laghu* or *alpa*; *bsdus pa*) *Kālacakra* tantra. The 'full title' of this text is: *Paramādibuddhodhṛta-Śrī-Kālacakra-nāma-tantrarāja*. Its 'short title' is: *Laghukālacakratantrarāja*, but we will refer to it by its proper name: *Śrī Kālacakra*.⁹ As its full title indicates, this *laghutantra* was 'extracted' (*uddhṛta*; *phyung ba*) from the *Paramādibuddha* – the *Kālacakra mūlatantra*. The *Śrī Kālacakra* consists of one thousand and forty-eight verses in the *sragdharā* metre. Thus, it is a bit less than one-fourth the length of the *Paramādibuddha*.¹⁰

After Kalkī Yaśas promulgated the *Śrī Kālacakra*, he ordered his son Puṇḍarīka to write a commentary on it. When Kalkī Yaśas passed away, Puṇḍarīka became the second Kalkī of Sambhala. (Puṇḍarīka was an emanation of Lokanātha or Lokeśvara, i.e., Avalokiteśvara.) The full title of Puṇḍarīka's commentary is: *Vimalaprabhā-nāma-mūlatantrānusāriṇī-dvādaśasāhasrikā-laghukālacakratantrarājatīkā*. "The *Vimalaprabhā*, a twelve thousand line commentary on the *Abridged Kālacakra King of Tantra*, following the *mūlatantra*."

The title of the *Vimalaprabhā* indicates that it 'follows' the *mūlatantra* – the *Paramādibuddha*. However, the *Vimalaprabhā* directly comments on the *Śrī Kālacakra*. Also, the *Śrī Kālacakra* presents the subject-matter of the *Kālacakra* system in a different order than the *Paramādibuddha*. It seems that the *Vimalaprabhā* comments on the *Śrī Kālacakra* following the definitive meaning (*nītārtha*; *nges don*) of the tantra as it is expressed in the *Paramādibuddha*.

The Kālacakra tradition asserts that there was an actual Kālacakra *mūlatantra* underlying the Kālacakra *laghutantra* and other Kālacakra texts that have come down to us. However, M. Nihom has published an article on the Kālacakra literature in the *Indo-Iranian Journal* in which he refers to “confusion” about the usage of the terms *mūlatantra* and *laghutantra* (p. 21, n. 33).¹¹ Nihom’s own proposal is that “the terms *mūlatantra* and *laghutantra* are not truly contrasted” (p. 22). Rather, these categories participate in a fluid hierarchy of “functional relationships” among the texts in a tantric corpus (p. 21). This sort of confusion does not exist among Tibetan scholars. They sometimes refer to a *laghutantra* as the basic tantra (*rtsa rgyud*) in a tantric corpus, but this is only because the actual *mūlatantra* was not translated into Tibetan. Thus, a *laghutantra* may function as the basic tantra text for exegetical purposes when the *mūlatantra* is not available. However, the Tibetans never intend that a *laghutantra* is an actual *mūlatantra*, or that the *mūlatantra* never existed in an historical sense.

Nihom says: “SD [the *Sekoddeśa*] makes explicit reference to the KCT [the *Śrī Kālacakra*; i.e., the Kālacakra *laghutantra*]” (p. 18, also pp. 19 & 22). Based on this, he says that the *Sekoddeśa* “implies that it is a short explanation of” the *Śrī Kālacakra* (p. 19). In fact, the *Sekoddeśa* does not make any reference to the *Śrī Kālacakra*, and it is not an explanation of any text. The “explicit reference” to the *Śrī Kālacakra* is supposed to occur in verse 7 of the *Sekoddeśa*:

*paṭalaih pañcabhiḥ śuddhaṃ lokadhātṛvādikair mataih/
satyābhyām ādibuddhaṃ syāt kālacakrābhīdhānakam||*

*/dag pa 'jig rten khams la sogs/
/le'u lnga yi gzhung rnams kyis/
/bden gnyis dang po'i sangs rgyas 'gyur/
/dus kyi 'khor lo mngon rjod byed/*

*/jig rten khams sogs brjod pa ste/
/le'u lnga yis dag pa ni/
/dus kyi 'khor lor mngon brjod de/
/bden gnyis dang po'i sangs rgyas yin/ ¹²*

There is no mention of the *Śrī Kālacakra* in this verse. The fact that it refers to the five chapters of the Kālacakra tantra is irrelevant – the Kālacakra *mūlatantra* and *laghutantra* both consist of five chapters.

Nihom (p. 18) is aware that the *Sekoddeśa* was requested by Sucandra and taught by the Buddha (cf. *Sekoddeśa* 1–2). Given the traditional history of the early Kālacakra literature, Nihom’s assertion of “the dependency of the SD [*Sekoddeśa*] on the KCT [*Śrī Kālacakra*]” (p. 22) is impossible. According to

the Kālacakra tradition, Vajrapāṇi Sucandra ‘withdrew his emanation body’ six hundred years before the birth of Yaśas, the redactor of the *Śrī Kālacakra*.

The *Sekoddeśa* is a part of the Kālacakra *mūlatantra*. This is apparent from the way the great Tibetan Kālacakra scholar Bu ston Rin chen grub refers to the *Sekoddeśa*: / *dus kyi 'khor lo'i rtsa ba'i rgyud kyi dum bu dbang mdor bstan pa 'bro shes rab grags kyi 'gyur*/.¹³ “The *Sekoddeśa*, a section of the Kālacakra *mūlatantra* – ‘Bro Shes rab grags’ translation.” One could repeat this identification of the *Sekoddeśa* from any number of other Tibetan sources.

The exact position of the *Sekoddeśa* within the *Paramādibuddha* cannot be easily determined from the text colophons to the Tibetan translations:

(1) *'jig rten khams kyi le'ur le'u lnga pa'i mchog tu mi 'gyur ba'i dbang gi sgrub thabs mdor bstan pa*.¹⁴

(2) *'jig rten gyi khams kyi le'u la sogs pa las le'u lnga pa mchog tu mi 'gyur ba'i dbang gis* (read: *gi*) *bsgrub pa mdor bsdus pa'i le'u zhes bya ba*.¹⁵

“The brief account for performance of initiation into the fifth chapter’s supreme unchanging (bliss, or gnosis); from (the fifth chapter of the *Paramādibuddha*’s five chapters –) the chapters on the cosmos and so forth.”

There are significant differences in the Tibetan translations of this text colophon (or, more accurately, colophons: the translators must have had variant texts in front of them). The large parenthetical insertion in my translation is based on *Kālacakrapāda’s statement in his *Sekoddeśaṭīkā*: *rtsa ba'i rgyud kyi le'u lnga pa las dbang mdor bstan pa 'di phyung ba yin*.¹⁶ “This *Sekoddeśa* was extracted from the fifth chapter of the *mūlatantra*.”

The *Sekoddeśa* probably represents the largest coherent fragment of the *Paramādibuddha* that has come down to us.¹⁷ However, the fragments of the *Paramādibuddha* that are scattered throughout the *Vimalaprabhā* and other commentaries, taken together, exceed the bulk of the *Sekoddeśa*. The first chapter of the *Vimalaprabhā* alone contains seventy-two verses quoted from the *Paramādibuddha* that are not taken from the *Sekoddeśa*. The four subsequent chapters of the *Vimalaprabhā* are also rich in *mūlatantra* quotations.

The fact that Puṇḍarīka cites the *Paramādibuddha* throughout the *Vimalaprabhā* is evidence in favor of the supposition that he had direct access to the Kālacakra *mūlatantra*. Further evidence is found in the second ‘Brief Account’ (*uddeśa*; *mdor bsdus*) of the *Vimalaprabhā*. There the subject-matter of the *Paramādibuddha* is described in terms of eighty-one topics. In Bu ston’s annotated edition of a Tibetan translation of the *Vimalaprabhā* he has attached notes to the eighty-one topics to show where each topic is treated in the *Śrī Kālacakra*.¹⁸ A careful comparison of this list of topics with the *Śrī Kālacakra* shows that the *Paramādibuddha* presents the subject-matter of the Kālacakra system in an order different than that of the *Śrī Kālacakra*. Puṇḍarīka’s knowledge of these topics, together with

his numerous citations from the *Paramādibuddha*, indicates that he had access to the text of the Kālacakra *mūlatantra*.

A similar situation occurs in other Indian Kālacakra commentaries.¹⁹ Nāro's *Paramārthasaṃgraha-nāma-sekoddeśaṭīkā*²⁰ contains a substantial number of verses quoted from the Kālacakra *mūlatantra*. One block of these verses occurs towards the beginning of the *Paramārthasaṃgraha*.²¹ This group of verses describes the Buddha's teaching of the *Paramādibuddha* at Dhānyakaṭaka. The same subject is dealt with in a block of verses from the *Paramādibuddha* appearing in the *Sekoddeśaṭippanī* of Sādhuputra Śrīdharānanda.²² Although Nāro's quotation and Sādhuputra's quotation both treat the same subject – Dhānyakaṭaka, they have no verses in common. Furthermore, none of these verses appear in the first chapter of the *Vimalaprabhā*.²³ This is circumstantial evidence that some form of the *Paramādibuddha* was in circulation in North India during the early part of the 11th century.²⁴

This hypothesis is further strengthened by a statement appearing in the author's colophon to *Kālacakrapāda's *Sekoddeśaṭīkā*:

/bdag gis rtsa rgyud sogs bltas nas/
/brtse bas 'grel pa bris ba yin/²⁵

“Having learned the *mūlatantra* and so forth, I wrote this commentary out of love (for sentient beings).”

The preceding information can be summarized as follows:

- (1) The *Śrī Kālacakra* and the *Vimalaprabhā* both presuppose the *Paramādibuddha* – the Kālacakra *mūlatantra*.
- (2) The Indian and Tibetan Kālacakra traditions are unanimous that the *Sekoddeśa* is a section extracted from the *Paramādibuddha*.
- (3) There are indications that other sections of the *mūlatantra* circulated in the form of independent texts.
- (4) The *Vimalaprabhā* contains many quotations from the *Paramādibuddha*.
- (5) The second ‘Brief Account’ in the first chapter of the *Vimalaprabhā* divides the subject-matter of the *Paramādibuddha* into eighty-one topics. The order of presentation of these topics differs significantly from the order of presentation of the same subject-matter in the *Śrī Kālacakra*.
- (6) Besides the *Vimalaprabhā*, other Indian Kālacakra commentaries contain numerous quotations from the *Paramādibuddha*.
- (7) One of the earliest commentators claims to have actually studied the *Paramādibuddha*.

The information presented above establishes the existence of some form of the *Paramādibuddha* in North India during the first half of the 11th century.

Discussion of the actual origin and authorship of this text will be taken up on a future occasion.

‘The case of the missing *mūlatantras*’ represents one of the most vexing and important problems within the sphere of Vajrayāna historical studies. In addition to the twelve thousand verse *Paramādibuddha*, the *Vimalaprabhā* refers to a twenty-five thousand verse *Śrī* [*Guhya*] *samāja*, a sixteen thousand verse *Māyājāla*, a thirty-six thousand verse *Yogānuviddha* (a Yamāntaka *mūlatantra*), and a *Mahālakṣābhīdhāna* (the Cakrasaṃvara *mūlatantra*). It even quotes these texts.²⁶

What were these tantras? Are such ‘fantastic’ numbers merely the products of over-active imaginations? Why didn’t these texts come down to us in Indian manuscripts, or in Chinese or Tibetan translations? The study of this problem has only begun.²⁷

NOTES

* Any merit to be found in this essay is due to the kindness of my teacher, Professor Geshe Lhundub Sopa.

¹ *Vimalaprabhā* (S) f. 21a/6–7.

² *Vimalaprabhā* (T) 419/7–420/2 (editor’s pagination).

³ I reverse the order of the last two clauses of the Sanskrit, and translate *sadguruṇā* as a plural, in accordance with the Tibetan translation.

⁴ For a more detailed treatment of the history of the Kālacakra see Newman (1985).

⁵ For details on this event see Hoffmann (1973). In this article Hoffmann has edited and translated the Sanskrit and Tibetan of several verses from the Kālacakra *mūlatantra* that are cited by Nāro in the *Paramārthasaṃgraha*. Prior to the verses treated by Hoffmann, Nāro quotes more verses from the *mūlatantra* that provide additional information on the first teaching of the Kālacakra system.

⁶ *Vimalaprabhā* (S) and other MSS. of the *Vimalaprabhā* consistently employ the form *sambhala*. *Vimalaprabhā* (T) and most other Tibetan translations use *sham bha la* or *sha mbha la* to transliterate this name.

⁷ *Vimalaprabhā* (S) f. 10a/3; *Vimalaprabhā* (T) 353/7. Here ‘line’ means a unit of thirty-two syllables, a *grantha*, used to measure texts written in prose or mixed verse and prose; e.g., the eight thousand ‘line’ *prajñāpāramitāsūtra*.

⁸ *Vimalaprabhā* (S) f. 9b/5; *Vimalaprabhā* (T) 351/6. For Yaśas’ conversion of the brahman sages of Sambhala, see Newman (1985: 59–63).

Previous scholars writing about the Kālacakra (e.g., Alexander Csoma de Kőrös, Giuseppe Tucci, and Helmut Hoffmann) have referred to Kalkī Yaśas as ‘Mañjuśrīkīrti, the Kulika of Śambhala.’ This is a mass of false reconstructions based on Tibetan translations. These erroneous reconstructions have tended to obscure the mythological parallel of Mañjuśrī Yaśas – the first Kalkī of Sambhala, and Viṣṇuyaśas – the chief brahman of the village of Śambhala and father of Kalki (or Kalkī), the tenth *avatāra* of Viṣṇu. (The *Mahābhārata* sometimes refers to Kalki himself as ‘Viṣṇuyaśas.’)

⁹ *Śrī Kālacakra* (S). This edition of the Sanskrit leaves much to be desired, but it mostly supersedes *Śrī Kālacakra* (S1). (N.B.: The ‘full title’ is given above as it appears at the beginning of the Tibetan translation, e.g., Peking #4.)

¹⁰ The *Paramādibuddha* is supposed to consist of twelve thousand verses in the *anuṣṭubh* metre (thirty-two syllables per verse). Therefore, it would have 384,000 syllables. The

Śrī Kālacakra consists of one thousand and forty-eight verses in the *śragdharā* metre (eighty-four syllables per verse). Thus, it consists of approximately 88,032 syllables.

Śrī Kālacakra (S) p. 23 omits a verse that appears in some old MSS. and in the Peking edition of the Tibetan translation; it has only one thousand and forty-seven verses. However, the verse in question should be included in a 'critical edition' of the *Śrī Kālacakra*; cf. *Vimalaprabhā* (S) f. 46a/2–3; *Vimalaprabhā* (T) 554/5–555/1.

¹¹ Nihom (1984). All references are to the page numbers of this article. In the chart on p. 20 add the following: (1) SDT 9 . . . KCT iii.12cd; (2) SDT 14 . . . KCT iii.88a & 88b; (3) SDT 15 . . . KCT iii.92; (4) SDT 26 . . . KCT iii.124; (5) SDT 35 . . . KCT iv.117; (6) SDT 61 . . . KCT v.73ab (most of these are printed as prose).

¹² *Sekoddeśa* 7. The first Tibetan translation is the translation contained in most editions of the *Kanjur* (e.g., Peking #3). The second translation is only extant in the unique manuscript *Phu sbrag dgon pa'i bka' gyur bris ma*. This *Kanjur* is one of the treasures in the collection of the Library of Tibetan Works and Archives, Dharamsala, Himachal Pradesh, India. Ven. Jampa Samten, bibliographer at the Library, is working on a descriptive catalogue of this *Kanjur*, and I am grateful to him for showing me this valuable translation of the *Sekoddeśa*.

¹³ Nishioka (1983: 70) (index #1546).

¹⁴ sDe dge: *rGyud 'bum KA PA*, p. 41/4–5 (f. 21a/4–5). This colophon is even less intelligible in the Peking edition (Peking #3; vol. 1, 127/3/6–7).

¹⁵ *Phu sbrag dgon pa'i bka' gyur bris ma*, KA, f. 81b/4. Compare *Kālacakrapāda's comment in his *Sekoddeśatīkā* (Peking #2070; vol. 47, 159/2/5–6); /'jig rten gyi khams kyi le'u la sogs pa las/ le'u lnga pa mchog tu mi 'gyur ba'i dbang gi sgrub pa'i mdor bsdu kyi le'u zhes pa ni/ skyob pa'm/ g.yogs pa'i le'u zhes bya'o/.

¹⁶ Peking #2070; vol. 47, 147/5/8–148/1/1. Cf. also the *ṭīkā*'s own text colophon (159/2/8): *dang po'i sangs rgyas kyi* (read: *kyi*) *rgyud las bkol ba//dbang mdor bstan pa zhes bya ba'i 'grel pa/ rnal 'byor pa dus kyi 'khor lo zhabs kyi mzdad pa rdzogs s.ho//*. "Thus ends the commentary on the excerpt from the *Ādibuddhantra* (i.e., the *Paramādibuddha*) called 'the *Sekoddeśa*'; by the yogi *Kālacakrapāda." See also Note 19 below.

¹⁷ Bu ston (writing ca. 1322) reports three erstwhile sections of the *Kālacakra mūlatantra* whose authenticity was questioned: (1) *lCe spyang rol pa*, (2) *rDo rje glu gar*, and (3) *bLa ma'i yon tan yongs su hzung ba* (Nishioka 1983: 70; index #1551–1553). Phur lcog Ngag dbang byams pa lists the same three texts in his *dkar chag* to the sNar thang *Kanjur*: *sNar thang bka' gyur*, KA, f. 104a/3–4 (I am indebted to Ven. Jampa Samten for pointing this passage out to me). Ngag dbang byams pa says these texts are not in the sNar thang *Kanjur* because Bu ston did not insert them among the tantras. Even so, he adds that Karma pa Rang byung rdo rje and dPa' bo gTsong lag 'phreng ba accepted these texts as authentic. He also mentions that they appear in the *dkar chag* of dBus pa bLo gsal, one of the editors of the Old sNar thang *Kanjur*. It is possible that these texts still exist in one of the *gsung 'bum* or other text collections of the Karma bKa' rgyud school.

¹⁸ *Vimalaprabhā* (T) 319/7–326/7. (N.B.: Many of the annotations are corrupt in the edition cited.)

¹⁹ Two quotations worth noting are: (1) Vajrararṇa's quotation of a verse from the **Śrī-Paramādibuddatantra-nāma* in his *Hevajrapañḍārthatīkā* (see *Hevajra* pp. 66–68 [n. 2]); and (2) Vajrapāṇi's quotation of *Sekoddeśa* 135 & 139 from "the 'Sekoddeśa' of the *Paramādibuddha*" in his *Lakṣābhīdhānādudhrtalaghutantrapañḍārthavivarāṇa-nāma* (Peking #2117; vol. 48, 173/3/2–4).

These two tantra commentaries, together with the *Vimalaprabhā*, make up the *Bodhisattva Corpus* (see Newman 1985: 73). Twenty years ago Malati J. Shendge announced a critical edition of the Hevajra *ṭīkā* (Shendge 1967: 128, n. 5). David Reigle and I recently identified four MSS. of Vajrapāṇi's commentary in Nepal, and Reigle is preparing a critical edition of the Sanskrit of this text.

²⁰ I have adopted the title of Nāro's *ṭīkā* as it is given in the Tibetan translation in order to

more easily distinguish it from *Kālacakrapāda's *Sekoddeśaṭīkā* (Peking #2070). Nāro probably died ca. 1040 A.D. – see Wylie (1982).

Michael Broido has recently written: “In spite of its title, Nāropa's *Sekoddeśaṭīkā* is a commentary not on the *Sekoddeśa*, but on the *abhisekapaṭala* of the *Kālacakratāntra*” (Broido 1985: 55 [n. 94]). This is incorrect. Nāro does cite and comment on a number of verses from the *abhisekapaṭala* of the *Śrī Kālacakra*, but he does this while commenting on the entire text of the *Sekoddeśa*.

²¹ *Paramārthasaṃgraha* (S) pp. 3–4; *Paramārthasaṃgraha* (T) 106/3/7–106/4/8 (see also Note 5 above).

²² Asiatic Society of Bengal MS. #10744, f. 1b/3–5 (see Shāstri 1917: 151–152); Peking #2069; vol. 47, 137/3/2–5.

²³ The Buddha's teaching of the *Paramādibuddha* is dealt with extensively in the first chapter of the *Vimalaprabhā*. I have not searched the four later chapters for these quotations, but the structure of the *Vimalaprabhā* makes it unlikely that they would appear there.

²⁴ I have found no historically verifiable reference to the Kālacakra system prior to the beginning of the 11th century. In any case, the *vajrācāryas* responsible for the early propagation of the Kālacakra can be dated to this period to the extent that they can be dated at all.

The *Śrī Kālacakra* and the *Vimalaprabhā* can be approximately dated based on internal evidence. *Śrī Kālacakra* I.27 and the *Vimalaprabhā*'s comment thereon (*Vimalaprabhā* [S] ff. 31b/7–32a/6; *Vimalaprabhā* [T] 480/1–482/3) contain a year 403 (*vahnau khe 'bdhau; me mkha' rgya mtsho*). This year serves as the basis of the astronomical era in the *Kālacakra laḡhukaraṇam*. The *Vimalaprabhā*'s commentary tells us that this year is “the year of the lord of the barbarians” (*mlecchendravarṣaṃ; kla klo'i dbang po'i lo*). It leaves no room for doubt that these barbarians are Muslims, and that their lord is “Muhammad, the incarnation of al-Rahman, the teacher of the barbarian religion, the guru and swami of the barbarian Tajiks” (*madhumatī rahmaṇāvātāro mlecchadharmadeśako mlecchānāṃ tāyināṃ guruḥ svāmī; sbrang rtsi'i blo gros te/ ra hma ṇa'i 'jug pa kla klo'i chos ston pa po kla klo stag gzig rnam kyī bla ma dang rje bo'o/*).

Scholars have assumed that the year 403 should be calculated in a chronology that is based on a lunisolar year, like that of the Kālacakra. Based on this, and other assumptions, they have determined that the year 403 corresponds to 1027 A.D. (For the more recent literature on this see the references in Grönbold 1983: 27–28 [n. 19].)

1027 A.D. corresponds to the first year of the newer Tibetan chronology. Bu ston explicitly asserts that the barbarian year 403 corresponds to the first year of the first Tibetan sexagenary cycle (Bu ston 1326: 781/4–782/5). He also notes that this is the year the Kālacakra astronomy “came south of the Śītā River,” i.e., went from Sambhala to India.

However, no one has considered the problem of the ultimate origin of the year 403. We should ask where someone writing in India during the first half of the 11th century could have obtained “the year of the lord of the barbarians.” (In the *Vimalaprabhā* Puṇḍarīka repeatedly writes, “here in the land of the Aryans,” and clearly defines “the land of the Aryans” as India). Given the context of “the year of the lord of the barbarians” in the *Śrī Kālacakra* and the *Vimalaprabhā*, it is obvious that the year 403 ultimately derives from Muslim circles. Therefore, the year 403 should be calculated according to the Muslim Hijra chronology: 403 A.H. corresponds to 1012–1013 A.D.

Even if we precisely determine the date of the year 403, we still have not necessarily determined the *exact* date of the composition of the *Śrī Kālacakra* and the *Vimalaprabhā*. Although the year 403 is employed for astronomical purposes, it is not put forward as the date of the composition of these texts. Nevertheless, the numerous references to the Muslim Tajiks appearing in the *Śrī Kālacakra* and the *Vimalaprabhā* prove that these texts were written some time during or shortly after the raids of Mahmūd of Ghaznī during the first three decades of the 11th century.

²⁵ Peking #2070; vol. 47, 159/2/7.

²⁶ *Vimalaprabhā* (S) ff. 12b/5–13a/6; *Vimalaprabhā* (T) 368/1–372/5.

²⁷ M. Nihom has pointed out Nāro's mention of a twenty-five thousand line *Śrī* [*Guhya*] *samāja mūlatantra* in contrast to the eighteen hundred line *laghutantra* (p. 21 [n. 17 & 30]).

D. L. Snellgrove has touched on the problem of the Hevajra *mūlatantra* (*Hevajra* pp. 15–18). Snellgrove says that Vajragarbha confuses the issue of the length of the Hevajra *mūlatantra* by sometimes referring to it as having 6,000 *ślokas*, and at other times as having 500,000 *ślokas* (*Hevajra* p. 17). This is incorrect. The number 6,000 refers to the number of *lines* in Vajragarbha's own commentary, the *Hevajrapinḍārthaṭīkā*, as can be seen in the *pariccheda* titles of that text. Vajragarbha in fact consistently refers to the Hevajra *mūlatantra* as having 500,000 verses.

Shinichi Tsuda has studied the problem of the Saṃvara *mūlatantra* (*Samvarodaya* pp. 27–45). It is worth noting that Nāro quotes eleven *ślokas* from the *Pañcalakṣābhīdhāna* (*Paramārthasaṃgraha* (S) pp. 67–68; *Paramārthasaṃgraha* (T) 134/1/1–134/2/1).

Ronald M. Davidson has remarked on the *Nāmasaṃgīti*'s statement that it is an extract from the *samādhi* chapter of a sixteen thousand verse *Māyājāla* (*Nāmasaṃgīti* p. 2).

Kenneth W. Eastman has produced a remarkable piece of scholarship in a paper entitled "The Eighteen Tantras of the *Vajrasekhara/Māyājāla*" (Eastman, 1981). Eastman appears to have identified a massive Vajrayāna corpus dating back to at least the 7th century.

REFERENCES

- Broido, Michael: 1985, 'Padma dKar-po on the Two *Satyas*', *Journal of the International Association of Buddhist Studies* 8, 7–59.
- Bu ston: 1326, *dPal dus kyi 'khor lo'i rtsis kyi bstan bcos mkhas pa rnam dga' bar byed pa*; Chandra, Lokesh (ed.), *The Collected Works of Bu-ston*, Part 4 (NGA) (International Academy of Indian Culture, New Delhi, 1965), pp. 615–857.
- sDe dge; *sDe dge bka' gyur* (Karmapa'i chos sde, Delhi, 1971 ff).
- Eastman, Kenneth W.: 1981, 'The Eighteen Tantras of the *Vajrasekhara/Māyājāla*' (Presented to the 26th International Conference of Orientalists in Japan; Tōkyo, May 8th 1981).
- Grönbold, Günter: 1983, 'Der sechsgliedrige Yoga des *Kālacakra-tantra*', *Asiatische Studien* 37, 25–45.
- Hevajra*; Snellgrove, D. L.: 1959, *The Hevajra Tantra: A Critical Study*, Part 1 (Oxford University Press, London).
- Hoffmann, Helmut: 1973, 'Buddha's Preaching of the *Kālacakra Tantra* at the Stūpa of Dhānyakataka', *German Scholars on India*, vol. 1 (The Chowkhamba Sanskrit Series Office, Varanasi), pp. 136–140.
- Nāmasaṃgīti*; Davidson, Ronald M.: 1981, 'The *Litany of Names of Mañjuśrī*: Text and Translation of the *Mañjuśrīnāmasaṃgīti*', *Mélanges Chinois et Bouddhiques* 20, 1–69.
- Newman, John: 1985, 'A Brief History of the *Kālacakra*', Sopha, Geshe Lhundub (ed.), *The Wheel of Time: The Kalachakra in Context* (Deer Park Books, Madison, Wisconsin), pp. 51–90.
- Nihom, M.: 1984, 'Notes on the Origin of Some Quotations in the *Sekoddeśaṭīkā* of *Naḍapāda*', *Indo-Iranian Journal* 27, 17–26.
- Nishioka, Soshū: 1983, 'Index to the Catalogue Section of Bu-ston's "History of Buddhism" (III)', *Annual Report of the Institute for the Study of Cultural Exchange, The University of Tōkyō* 6, 47–201.
- Paramārthasaṃgraha* (S); Carelli, Mario E. (ed.); 1941, *Sekoddeśaṭīkā of Naḍapāda* (Oriental Institute, Baroda), [Gaekwad's Oriental Series no. 90].
- Paramārthasaṃgraha* (T); Peking #2068, vol. 47.
- Peking; Suzuki, Daisetz T. (ed.): 1955 ff., *The Tibetan Tripitaka: Peking Edition* (Tibetan Tripitaka Research Institute, Tokyo-Kyoto).

- Samvarodaya*; Tsuda, Shin'ichi: 1974, *The Samvarodaya-tantra: Selected Chapters* (The Hokuseido Press, Tokyo).
- Sekoddeśa*; Newman, John (ed.), *The Sekoddeśa: Sanskrit Text and Two Tibetan Translations Critically Edited* (in preparation).
- Shāstri, Hara Prasad: 1917, *A Descriptive Catalogue of Sanscrit Manuscripts in the Government Collection Under the Care of the Asiatic Society of Bengal*, vol. 1 (Asiatic Society of Bengal, Calcutta).
- Shendge, Malati J.: 1967, 'Śrīśahajasiddhi', *Indo-Iranian Journal* 10, 126–149.
- Śrī Kālacakra* (S); Banerjee, Biswanath (ed.): 1985, *A Critical Edition of Śrī Kālacakratāntra-rāja* (The Asiatic Society, Calcutta).
- Śrī Kālacakra* (S1); Vira, Raghu and Chandra, Lokesh (ed.): 1966, *Kālacakra-tantra and Other Texts*, Part 1 (International Academy of Indian Culture, New Delhi), pp. 332–378.
- Vimalaprabhā* (S); Asiatic Society of Bengal, Calcutta, MS. G. 10766; palm leaf; Old Bengali script; dated 39th year of Harivarmadeva of Bengal (reigned ca. 11th–12th cent.); for more remarks see Shāstri 1917: 79–82.
- Vimalaprabhā* (T); Chandra, Lokesh (ed.): 1965, *The Collected Works of Bu-ston*, Part 1 (KA) (International Academy of Indian Culture, New Delhi), pp. 301–603 (editor's pagination).
- Wylie, Turrell V.: 1982, 'Dating the Death of Nāropa', Hercus, L. A. *et al* (ed.), *Indological and Buddhist Studies* (Faculty of Asian Studies [The Australian National University], Canberra), pp. 687–692.

University of Wisconsin, Madison